DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment December 16, 2009. Claims 3, 6 and 8 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 9 are pending. Applicant is reminded that the non-elected claim 9 must be cancelled should this application become allowed.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 16, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent on cancelled claim 3. A correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Applicant has amendment the claim to overcome the antecedent basis issue in the claim. The rejection is now withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 2002/0078161 A1) in view of Zintel et al. (US 2002/0035621).

Regarding claim 1, Cheng teaches a method for providing a changed input parameter from a network station in a network of a first type (abstract: i.e. UpnP device) to a network of a second type (abstract: i.e. non-UpnP device), which is connected via a gateway [0018 – UpnP enabling device 200 that bridges UpnP user control point to multiple non-UPnP-compliant devices 150] to the network of the first type, the network protocols of the first network of the second type failing to have a dedicated process for informing the network stations in said second about an input parameter change of a network station in said network for a first type in a normal operation state (this feature is inherent because the UPnP devices alone cannot control the non-UpnP devices, which is why the UpnP enabling device is needed to emulate the non-UPnP devices), wherein the network station from the network of the

first type which has a changed input parameter logged off by the gateway in the

network of the second type, in that the changed input parameter is mapped onto an

information element which is known in the network of the second type, and the network

station from the network of the first type which has changed input parameter is then

once again logged on in the network of the second type, so that the network stations in

the network of the second type are informed about the changed input parameter in a

log on phase [0026: devices log off, 0028 and 0029: whenever a device changes state,

it notifies all subscribers of the event].

However, Cheng does not explicitly teach wherein the network of the second

type is a UPnP network, where UPnP stands for Universal Plug and Play, wherein the

changed input parameter corresponds to a name of the network station in the network

of the first type which is mapped onto an information element existing in the UPnP

network called FriendlvName of an XML appliance description for the network station

which relates to the changed input parameter.

Nevertheless, the feature is known in the art as evidence by Zintel et al. Zintel

teaches a UPnP network, where UPnP stands for Universal Plug and Play, wherein the

changed input parameter corresponds to a name of the network station in the network

of the first type which is mapped onto an information element existing in the UPnP

network called FriendlvName of an XML appliance description for the network station

which relates to the changed input parameter [0011; 0078; 0261]. At the time the

invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

employ FriendlyName which relates to the changed input parameter in order to enable

a more précised identification of a device [see 0078].

Regarding claim 2, Cheng teaches the method as claimed in claim 1, according

to which the network of the first type is a network which is based on an international

standard called HAVi Standard, where HAVi stands for Home Audio/Video

Interoperability (abstract: HAVi device).

Regarding claim 4, Cheng teaches the method as claimed in claim 1, in which

the logging-off and logging-on again of the network station from the network of the first

type, which relates to the input parameter are carried out in accordance with the

Simple Service Discovery Protocol SSDP, in particular using the ssdp::byebye logging-

off message and the ssdp::alive logging-on message [figure 3, 0024].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cheng in view of Zintel, in further view of Dara-Abrams et al. US 6,456,892).

Regarding claim 5, Cheng fails to explicitly teach the method as claimed in claim 3, in which the input parameter is a HAVi defined UserPreferredName, which corresponds to the user defined name of a HAVi network station. In an analogous art, Dara-Abrams teaches an input parameter which is a HAVi defined userPreferredName, which corresponds to the user defined name of a HAVi network station (col. 36, lines 10-16). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ UserPreferredName parameter in order to allow the user to name the parameter according to his or her preferences, thus giving the user more control of the device.

Regarding claim 7, Cheng fails to explicitly teach the method as claimed in claim 1, in which a text input menu is provided for user-defined inputting of the input parameter from a network station. However, Dara-Abrams teaches this deficiency in figure 7. At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Henry with the teaching of Dara-Abrams in order to allow user to easily define the device according to his or her preference.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALINA N. BOUTAH whose telephone number is (571)272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia L.M. Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alina N Boutah/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443